UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/509,400 | 06/09/2005 | Clyde James Barnes | PPD 50679 | 5701 |
| | 7590 09/16/200 ROP PROTECTION , | EXAMINER | | |
| PATENT AND TRADEMARK DEPARTMENT 410 SWING ROAD GREENSBORO, NC 27409 | | | ARNOLD, ERNST V | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1616 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/16/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 10/509,400 | BARNES ET AL. | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | ERNST V. ARNOLD | 1616 | |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>19 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi ral (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). | g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII | n. LED WITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| | ust prior to the data of filing a brick | will make a sectional ba | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | isideration and/or search (see NOTw); | ΓE below); | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett | er form for appeal by materially red | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | timely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | I be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | | | |
| | /Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art U | nit 1616 | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts that the primary ref of Moreno et al. teaches away from preparing aqueous solutions and in the 52 different formulation examples water is not taught and it is clearly desired to exclude water. The Examiner cannot agree. Moreno et al. clearly teach taking the composition in a bag and dissolving it in water to make an aqueous solution (column 10, lines 42-47). The amount of required water used is dependent upon use which is readily determined by one of ordinary skill in the art of herbicidal compositions. Moreno et al. clearly teach that the bags are thrown into the needed amount of water where the polymer boag disappears within 2 minutes and the herbicide coposition is dissolved completely or is dispersed in the water to give a composition which can be used directly in the field (column 19, lines 12-29). Moreno et al. also teach that an effective amount of the composition according to the invention can be dispersed on plants in the form of aqueous or water organic solvent solutions or dispersions or suspension (column 10, lines 48-55). Finally, Moreno et al. teach one embodiment where compositions II.34 or II.36 were dispersed in water (column 24, lines 65-67). The Examiner can only conclude that, contrary to Applicant's assertions, that Moreno et al. clearly contemplate, teach and suggest aqueous solutions of the compositions. Claims 1 and 3-23 remain rejected.